DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 464 247 CE 083 207

TITLE	Evaluation of the Implementation of the Quality Assurance Framework and Standards for Approval of Higher Education Institutions and Programmes. Research Highlights.
INSTITUTION	English National Board for Nursing, Midwifery and Health Visiting, London.
REPORT NO	No-50
PUB DATE	2002-02-00
NOTE	8p.
AVAILABLE FROM	English National Board for Nursing, Midwifery and Health Visiting, Publications Department, Victory House, 170 Tottenham Court Road, London W1T 7HA, England, United Kingdom. Tel: 0207-391-6314; e-mail: pubs@enb.org.uk. For full text: http://www.nmc-uk.org/cms/content/Publications/rh50.pdf.
PUB TYPE	Reports - Descriptive (141)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01 Plus Postage. PC Not Available from EDRS.
DESCRIPTORS	Coordination; Developed Nations; Educational Cooperation; Evaluation Methods; Foreign Countries; Higher Education; *National Standards; *Nursing Education; *Obstetrics; Partnerships in Education; Postsecondary Education; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; Program Implementation; *Quality Control; Reliability; Theory Practice Relationship
IDENTIFIERS	*Midwives; *United Kingdom

ABSTRACT

A project evaluated the quality assurance (QA) processes put in place by the English National Board from 1998. The Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) represented a shift of emphasis in audit activity from approval/validation of programs to continuous annual monitoring and review. The evaluation used a mixture of methods, including survey and case studies, to investigate the effectiveness of all aspects of the QAF and the perceptions of all involved in nursing and midwifery education, including students, with regard to these new processes. The process and outcomes of the Subject Review process undertaken in collaboration with the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education were also included in the evaluation. Respondents agreed that the information obtained through collaboration appropriately assured the quality of nursing and midwifery education in relation to theory. But they expressed considerable concerns about whether the same was true for practice. Regarding the evaluation of the QAF, these key themes emerged from the data: the provision of a national framework for quality assurance; maintenance of professional standards for education and practice; constructive scrutiny and ensuring the reliability and validity of the evidence base; and establishing an ethos of partnership and collaboration. (YLB)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 464 247

Research Highlights 50

Evaluation of the Implementation of the Quality Assurance Framework and Standards for Approval of Higher Education Institutions and Programmes

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

O. Akinade

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

28

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

CE083207

QUALITY EDUCATION FOR QUALITY CARE
ENB
FIFTY

research
HIGHLIGHTS

FEBRUARY 2002

Evaluation of the Implementation of the Quality Assurance Framework and Standards for approval of Higher Education Institutions and Programmes

Research Team Members
Rosemary Pope, Professor of Nurse Education
Lesley Graham, Research Fellow
Lynne Clawson, Research Midwife

Steering Group
Mike Nolan (Chair), Professor of Gerontological Nursing, School of Nursing and Midwifery, University of Sheffield
Sue Bernhauser, Head of Institute, Nursing & Midwifery, University of Brighton
Sonia Crow, Assistant Director for Educational Policy, ENB
John Hilbourne, Consultant
Kath Hinchliff, West Yorkshire Consortium Manager, West Yorkshire Education & Training Consortium
Richard Hogston, Head of School, School of Nursing, University of Hull
Martin Johnson, Professor in Nursing, School of Nursing, University of Salford
Rita Le Var, Director for Educational Policy, ENB
Jane Marr, Director (Adult & Children's Nursing), ENB
Peter McAndrew, Education Officer, ENB
Malcolm McVicar, Vice Chancellor, University of Central Lancashire

English National Board for Nursing, Midwifery and Health Visiting

Victory House
170 Tottenham Court Road
London W1T 7HA

Telephone: 020 7388 3131
Fax: 020 7383 4031

Abstract

This project evaluated the quality assurance processes put in place by the English National Board from 1998 (ENB, 1997a & 1998). The Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) represented a shift of emphasis in audit activity from approval/validation of programmes to continuous Annual Monitoring and Review. The QAF was designed to maintain professional standards for education and practice through the use of a systematic quality assurance process. The application of the standards within the QAF was intended to enable the process of constructive scrutiny of programmes and Higher Education Institutions (HEIs) using a valid and reliable evidence-base.

The process and outcomes of the Subject Review process undertaken in collaboration with the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education were also included within the evaluation.

The evaluation used a mixture of methods, including survey and case studies, to investigate the effectiveness of all aspects of the QAF and the perceptions of all involved in nursing and midwifery education, including students, with regard to these new processes.

Expertise and understanding of quality assurance has increased during the lifetime of the project amongst key staff within HEIs and the ENB. A transparent system of documentation is beginning to emerge albeit with some local interpretation. There is a greater notion of partnership and common understanding of how to judge quality.

This evaluation has taken place during a time of considerable change in nursing and midwifery education and currently new quality assurance processes are being piloted by the QAA and developed by the Nursing and Midwifery Council. The findings from this project will be of interest to all involved in the education of nurses and midwives and who are concerned to ensure that this education enables students to meet the competencies for practice, be fit for practice and have their name entered on the appropriate Part of the Professional Register.

Interim Findings

The findings that are presented here should be considered as **interim findings**. The final report is due for completion in March 2002; data analysis and report writing is ongoing. The Board was concerned that the interim findings should be available to inform future quality assurance processes.

Background

A new QAF was developed for the application of the ENB's standards (ENB, 1998/1997a) in order to reflect the changes in nursing and midwifery education and provide a systematic approach to the assessment of the quality of teaching and learning. The move of nursing and midwifery education into higher education and the establishment of a single agency for quality assurance in this sector; the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA), which was charged with the assessment of all the quality of all higher education provision, were major external change factors.

The Quality Assurance Agency introduced a process of Subject Review (QAA, 1997) which evaluated the quality of educational provision within a subject area, e.g. 'nursing'. The QAA aimed to work with professional and statutory bodies, e.g. the ENB, to achieve best practice in quality assurance and the integration of key review processes.

Over this same period, the commissioning of nursing and midwifery education was developing. The need to rationalise the evidence base required by the different stakeholders and reduce the duplication of effort required to assure the quality of nursing and midwifery education became paramount.

The ENB sought to meet the needs of all involved, including adopting a common framework and sharing evidence whilst maintaining professional standards in education and practice. Assessment of quality would be undertaken using a reliable tool - the Standards, within a systematic framework. (The standards had themselves been designed with the QAA assessment categories in mind.) This process would lead to valid assessments of the quality of education and could lead to the development of national overview of trends and enable comparability.

The new processes resulted in a major change in the focus for quality assurance for nursing and midwifery education. There was a move away from programme approval, e.g. the validation event, as the main quality indicator to a system of continuous programme monitoring and annual review. There was general support for the framework following national consultation with key stakeholders (ENB, 1997b).

There was also agreement between the ENB and the QAA that the processes of Subject Review (SR) and of ENB Annual Monitoring and Review (AMR) could occur together. The QAA and ENB developed a model for collaboration (joint SR/AMR) which recognised both the similarities in the evidence base for quality assurance and the differences in relation to statutory purpose and the nature of the decisions emerging from the two processes: Subject Review 'would not determine AMR outcomes but contribute to it' (ENB, 1998:52).

The quality assurance framework was put in place from September 1998 to April 2002. The intention was to provide a clear model and set the standards for nursing and midwifery education. It was a major change in a time of constant upheaval in the sector, in part due to the results of the review of professional preparation (UKCC, 1999) and the proposed changes to the professional regulatory body.

The implementation of any change would be expected to take time to become embedded, especially any change occurring within such a climate. The quality assurance processes were large-scale and complex and findings presented need to be understood and read within this context.

Collaborative Subject Review/Annual Monitoring and Review

Collaboration between the ENB and QAA

Findings from the case studies of the collaborative review processes between the QAA and ENB are included in brief as they have already been reported elsewhere (Graham et al, 2001). The collaborative SR/AMR process was undertaken in each HEI in England that provided nursing, midwifery or health visiting education over a two-year period from 1998. (Please see Methods for detail.)

The collaborative relationship between the organisations was generally understood by the external reviewers but less so by the HEI staff who perceived that this was primarily a QAA review visit. There was less understanding or status accorded to the ENB role or processes, including ongoing AMR activities during that year.

Collaboration between the NHS and HE

In the collaborative review process, the NHS service providers and education and training consortia gave 'evidence' to the reviewers regarding the perceived quality of education, but also had been involved in the commissioning and/or providing aspects for the education (particularly in the practice setting).

This meant that the NHS representatives were **both** reviewing and providing the education, leading to potential concerns regarding the reliability and validity of the data being used to contribute to the review process. The NHS, QAA and NMC may wish to consider this issue during

the development of the models for the new quality assurance processes in nursing, midwifery and health visiting education.

Assessment of teaching and learning and the integration of theory and practice

The assessment of theory was undertaken through teaching observations and the scrutiny of samples of student work. There was agreement amongst all respondents that the information obtained through collaborative SR/AMR processes appropriately assured the quality of nursing and midwifery education in relation to theory. There were considerable concerns expressed about whether the same could be claimed for practice.

The observation of teaching and learning in clinical placements was not included as part of the SR/AMR process. The external reviewers were able to examine practice indirectly through examination of ENB practice reports, meetings with students and service staff (including practice assessors), and clinical audit data. The majority of respondents felt that not enough attention was paid to practice nor that the information they obtained could be said to appropriately assure the quality of practice education.

"The information about practice is held by the ENB Officers and often accepted as it stands. There is not time to check it out during the review visits other than by questioning the people the institutions chose to represent practice." (Respondent comment)

The assessment of practice was identified by the majority of respondents as the key area where it was not possible for the joint needs of the QAA and ENB to be addressed through the collaborative review process. The QAA process was not structured to allow sufficient time to monitor and assess practice nor the integration of theory and practice in nursing and midwifery education:

"ongoing and continuous monitoring of professional standards in nursing and midwifery education by the ENB is also complementary to the collaborative SR/AMR which is very much a 'snapshot' in time." (Respondent comment)

This is an area for priority consideration during the development of future plans for reviewing nursing and midwifery education. The matter of reviewing practice based education is extremely complex, e.g. how reliable and valid are sampling methods for the direct observation of practice and what measures would be used?

Process of self-appraisal

The principle of self-appraisal and critical evaluation by the HEI was the source of much debate. Interestingly the students understood and valued the principle of self-assessment underpinning the review process.

Reviewers discussed the variable standard of aims and objectives set by the HEIs. The QAA reviewed the aims and objectives set by each HEI prior to the Review visit, to ensure that they were satisfied with the information against which the judgements were to be made. However, the information obtained by the research team indicated wide variability in the aims and objectives set countrywide for professional education, particularly at continuing professional development level.

It was generally accepted that if an HEI was to set 'fairly modest' aims and objectives for its own attainment, that it should fairly easily achieve its own standard. However, where innovation was being demonstrated through the education provider's own aims and objectives, there was potential for greater difficulty in demonstrating a high quality of education, particularly in the early stages of a programme's development. Clearly this raised issues about the valuing of innovation in education and the way that the Subject Review process had evaluated 'best practice'.

The considerable efforts involved in preparation for the review process were considered by many HEI staff to have, of themselves, led to an improvement in the quality processes underpinning the education provision. These improvements were considered likely to have a broader impact on the continued quality assurance systems. None of those represented in this evaluation indicated that the time spent preparing for the review was likely to have had a negative impact on the student experience.

Issues related to inter-professional and multi-disciplinary approaches to education were raised by HE and NHS staff indicating that the current system was considered to be tailored to assess a single educational discipline and did not take account of nor allow for differential grading of midwifery or the 'sub-disciplines' in nursing.

The Quality Assurance Framework

The ENB Quality Assurance Framework was the focus of the research methods used in this section, including Annual Monitoring and Review (AMR). The methods included survey, documentary analysis, observations and interviews (see Methods section for detail). The AMR process was intended to provide a detailed assessment of programmes of study using the standards for approval of higher education institutions and programmes (ENB, 1997a).

The AMR reporting included a review grid which provided an overview to the judgements made about each programme within an HEI and enabled the identification of trends within a programme and across groups of programmes. The standards were judged against four levels of achievement: unmet, partially met, met at threshold and met above threshold, with threshold standard being the minimum acceptable level of achievement. Developmental plans were required if the threshold level was not achieved. The ENB also decided to pilot the process of giving each level of achievement a numerical score or grade in line with current QAA practice.

As already stated these findings should be considered as **interim findings** as analysis and report writing is ongoing. There are a number of key themes that are emerging from the data at the present time: 1) the provision of a national framework for quality assurance; 2) maintenance of professional standards for education and practice; 3) constructive scrutiny and ensuring the reliability and validity of the evidence base and 4) establishing an ethos of partnership and collaboration. Findings related to the piloting of the grading of the standards is also included.

1) The provision of a national framework for quality assurance

There were indications of the development of in-depth expertise in quality assurance by Education Officers (EOs) and key staff involved within HEI, e.g. senior managers and Programme Leaders. At the early stages of implementation there was less understanding, particularly amongst teaching staff, about the quality assurance framework and much more scepticism about its purpose and effectiveness. The positive benefits of the QAF were more visible to all concerned by the end of the second year of its implementation.

The Heads of the HEIs and the students were generally positive towards the idea of external quality assurance. There was a reasonable level of awareness of the purpose and principles of quality assurance amongst survey respondents, but this was general rather than specific to the QAF.

The QAF had led to the beginnings of a transparent system of documentation across England. It appeared robust as a framework although there were some issues, e.g. local interpretation of criteria and grading within standards. The potential for establishing benchmark levels of achievement of the standards to emerge from the implementation of the QAF had not been fully realised. This might be due to a number of factors, including the limited QAF implementation timescale, and changes to professional regulation and the impact of this for the ENB.

2) Maintenance of professional standards for education and practice

It is clear that the potential of the QAF to accurately and adequately assure the quality of education was viewed differently by HEI survey respondents in terms of the assessment of theory and practice elements of programmes.

Quality assurance of theoretical elements of programmes was seen as being, to some extent, different to the quality assurance of the practice elements. This led respondents to record that they felt less confident about the ability of the quality assurance mechanisms to effectively assess the quality of education to do with practice or which takes place in practice settings.

Comments from survey respondents indicated a variety of possible reasons for these perceptions, including the pace of change in clinical practice and that practice is a fluid phenomenon and inherently more difficult to assess. Quality assurance mechanisms need to be designed to more appropriately capture and assure practice learning.

The EOs however, indicated that there was potential for their practice placement visits to aid audit and raise the standards in clinical areas through guidance based on their professional expertise in education and practice. Observations of the EOs' practice placement visits would support this view.

3) Constructive scrutiny and ensuring the reliability and validity of the evidence base

The developmental planning element of the QAF and the use of the standards was perceived as a strength. It enabled negotiation and discussion between the ENB and HEI and provided a transparent framework for assessment and action planning. The QAF processes provided the EOs with the potential to pool information across a range of institutions, which could enable standards of good practice to be identified and to permeate across the country.

The quality assurance framework had also acted as a tool for identifying up problems, e.g. External Examiner's attendance at ENB workshops. Issues such as this could be fed-back to the ENB and had also enabled HEIs to pick up on things that they now wished to monitor themselves. The HEIs appeared to understand quality assurance in a new way, e.g. the need for evidence, and to perceive that the QAF and the standards could help in assuring the quality of their education provision.

Issues have arisen in relation to the extent to which the quality assurance framework was consistently and reliably applied. The documentation was variable, with some AMR reports being more comprehensive than others.

The AMR form allowed for the demonstration of the broad professional expertise of the EOs and development of the role in cases where it was used well. Some examples of documentation made the whole programme and quality assurance process come alive to the reader and had the potential to be a very useful resource for all stakeholders.

Education Officers identified the need for developmental workshops on the implementation of the QAF processes and formal support during its implementation through forums for discussion or developmental support for the EOs in their new roles within the QAF.

4) Establishing an ethos of partnership and collaboration

There has been the development of relationships between the ENB, the HEI, the Trusts and the Consortia in the last couple of years. A key strength has been the element of developmental planning and continuous monitoring and review of programmes within QAF, which has also enabled all involved to build towards a partnership model of education provision. There

was a sense that all concerned were beginning to perceive quality assurance as a coherent process.

The EOs' role in providing professional advice and expertise extended from formal processes, e.g. validation events and practice placement visits, to informal processes such as chats in the car, and highlighted the breadth and continuous nature of the ENB's quality assurance processes. The role appeared to be valued by all HEI and NHS staff during observation visits, in particular, the EOs' involvement in the developmental work building relationships and partnerships between HEIs, Trusts and education commissioning bodies.

Piloting of the grading of standards

Both the qualitative and quantitative grading of standards were generally implemented as outlined in the guidance (ENB, 1998), but there appeared to have been reservations about their application. There were issues related to the exercise of professional judgement by EOs and departure from the formula, most notably the tendency to err on the generous side and award grade 3 (met at threshold) when the calculations indicated a grade 2. Some EOs felt that there was a psychological/emotional reaction in the HEI to being graded, e.g. 'partially met' was perceived to be more developmental than 'grade 2'.

The EO's appeared to be applying a level of individual interpretation of the grades which could be affected by a number of factors, e.g. experience as EO, relationship with HEI, support within ENB office and EOs' philosophical approach to grading. The quantitative grading was generally perceived as an extra element of questionable value. The standardisation of interpretation and approach will continue to be issues within quality assurance processes.

Methods

A multi-method approach was used to address the research aims including in-depth case studies, a national survey, interviews, observation of AMR activities and documentary analysis. Information was obtained from a wide range of stakeholders on all aspects of the implementation of the QAF and the standards.

Case study

In-depth case studies were undertaken in eight sites across England in relation to the collaborative Subject Review/Annual Monitoring and Review during academic year 1999/2000. The sites were chosen to reflect the range of initial and continuing education provision with ENB approval within England. The range of review activities were observed and detailed notes were taken.

Questionnaires were sent to all staff of the School/Faculty, NHS staff and students (past and present) who had attended the reviews in all eight case study sites. The Review Chair, Subject Reviewers and ENB Education Officer were also sent a questionnaire. The questionnaires covered all aspects related to the process and outcomes of the collaborative review process.

An executive summary of this aspect of the project has already been formally reported (Graham et al, 2001).

National survey data

A national survey was undertaken in 2000/2001 involving thirty-two HEIs (approximately 1 in 3 HEIs that offer nursing, midwifery and health visiting programmes of education). The sample reflected the national picture in relation to size and type of ENB approved educational provision. Sixteen of the HEIs in the survey were pilot sites for the grading of the standards. The other 16 sites were selected to be similar to the pilot sites in terms of type and scale of educational provision and geographical location.

Data were obtained through postal questionnaires which were distributed to a wide range of stakeholders in the 32 HEIs, including all Heads of the HEIs; a sample of approximately 1 in 3 HEI staff from the range of clinical backgrounds represented within each School/Faculty; student representatives from all programmes provided within the HEIs; staff from all NHS Trusts associated with the HEIs, e.g. Chief Executive/Chief Nurse; and Workforce Development Confederation (formerly educational consortia) managers responsible for commissioning nursing and midwifery education. Detailed information in relation to sample sizes will be included in the final report.

The questions covered a broad range of issues related to the implementation of the QAF. Specific questions focused on the standards for approval of institutions and programmes including the effectiveness of the standards as audit tools for assessment of educational quality and the validity and reliability of the data collection methods in each section of the famework. Issues related to the standards associated with the assessment of practice (including the integration of theory and practice) were covered in detail.

Interviews, documentary analysis and observations

Group interviews were held with ENB Education Officers in each of the four regional offices. Documentary analysis was undertaken of the AMR reports from the 32 HEIs involved in the project. Reports on a total of 411 initial and continuing education programmes were analysed. In addition the research team undertook observations of the range of quality assurance processes; approval of programmes, quinquennial review, practice placement visits and annual monitoring and review within a range of settings.

For further information please contact:
Professor Rosemary Pope or Lesley Graham at
University of Surrey, Centre for Research in Nursing & Midwifery Education School of Educational Studies, University of Surrey, Guildford, GU2 7XH.
Tel: 01483 683120.

Details about the Project

The Centre for Research in Nursing and Midwifery Education, University of Surrey, was commissioned in 1999 by the English National Board for Nursing, Midwifery and Health Visiting (ENB) to undertake a three year evaluation of the implementation of the Quality Assurance Framework (QAF) (ENB, 1998) and Standards for Approval of Higher Education Institutions and Programmes (ENB, 1997a). The evaluation was undertaken between January 1999 and December 2001.

The evaluation investigated all aspects of the QAF, including the collaborative review processes undertaken between the ENB and the Quality Assurance Agency for Higher Education (QAA) through a mixed method research design, including survey, case studies, interviews and documentary analysis.

The methods enabled the range of stakeholders, including students, to participate and contribute their views in relation to their preparation for the implementation of the standards and the new framework for quality assurance. Issues related to the effectiveness of the QAF in assessing educational quality both in theory and practice, the application and use of the standards and the validity and reliability of the data collection methods in each section of the QAF were also evaluated.

References

English National Board for Nursing, Midwifery and Health Visiting (1997a) Standards for Approval of Higher Education Institutions and Programmes. ENB: London

English National Board for Nursing, Midwifery and Health Visiting (1997b) Evaluation of Self-Validation of Educational Programmes. ENB: London

English National Board for Nursing, Midwifery and Health Visiting (1998) Quality Assurance Manual. ENB: London

Graham, L., Pope, R. and Woodward, V. (2001) Evaluation of the process and outcomes of collaborative Subject Review and Annual Monitoring and Review: Executive Summary. ENB: London (limited circulation)

Quality Assurance Agency (1997) Subject Review Handbook: October 1998 – September 2000. QAA: Gloucester

United Kingdom Central Council for Nursing, Midwifery and Health Visiting (1999) Fitness for Practice. UKCC: London

Published by
English National Board for Nursing, Midwifery and Health Visiting
February 2002

© English National Board for Nursing, Midwifery and Health Visiting

CE0E3 207

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: RESEARCH HIGHLIGHTS NO 50. EVALUATION OF THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE QUALITY ASSURANCE FRAMEWORK & STANDARDS FOR APPROVAL OF HIGHER EDUCATION INSTITUTIONS & PROGRAMMES

Author(s):

Corporate Source: ENB

Publication Date:

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☐

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☑

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, → please

Signature: O. Akinade	Printed Name/Position/Title: O. AKINADE
Organization/Address: ENB	Telephone: FAX:
	E-Mail Address: Date: 13/3/02

(over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

Cheryl Grossman
Processing Coordinator
ERIC Clearinghouse on Adult, Career, and Vocational Education
Center on Education and Training for Employment
1900 Kenny Road
Columbus, OH 43210-1090

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to: